For The Second Amendment By Benjamin Greschler

U.S. Dept of Justice Report 1993 - 2011 (Latest)
https://web.archive.org/web/20210712105019/https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/fv9311.pdf
(Cited below)

TABLE 1
Criminal firearm violence, 1993–2011

		Number				Percent	
Year	Total fatal and nonfatal firearm violence	Firearm homicides	Nonfatal firearm victimizations[a]	Nonfatal firearm incidents[b]	Rate of nonfatal firearm victimization[c]	All violence involving firearms	All firearm violence that was homicide
1993	1,548,000	18,253	1,529,700	1,222,700	7.3	9.2%	1.2%
1994	1,585,700	17,527	1,568,200	1,287,200	7.4	9.3	1.1
1995	1,208,800	15,551	1,193,200	1,028,900	5.5	7.9	1.3
1996	1,114,800	14,037	1,100,800	939,500	5.1	7.9	1.3
1997	1,037,300	13,252	1,024,100	882,900	4.7	7.7	1.3
1998	847,200	11,798	835,400	673,300	3.8	7.0	1.4
1999	651,700	10,828	640,900	523,600	2.9	6.1	1.7
2000	621,000	10,801	610,200	483,700	2.7	7.3	1.7
2001	574,500	11,348	563,100	507,000	2.5	7.7	2.0
2002	551,800	11,829	540,000	450,800	2.3	7.4	2.1
2003	479,300	11,920	467,300	385,000	2.0	6.2	2.5
2004	468,100	11,624	456,500	405,800	1.9	6.9	2.5
2005	515,900	12,352	503,500	446,400	2.1	7.4	2.4
2006	627,200	12,791	614,400	552,000	2.5	7.4	2.0
2007	567,400	12,632	554,800	448,400	2.2	8.3	2.2
2008	383,500	12,179	371,300	331,600	1.5	6.0	3.2
2009	421,600	11,493	410,100	383,400	1.6	7.4	2.7
2010	426,100	11,078	415,000	378,800	1.6	8.6	2.6
2011[d]	478,400	11,101	467,300	414,600	1.8	8.2	2.3

Note: See appendix table 3 for standard errors.

[a]A victimization refers to a single victim that experienced a criminal incident.

[b]An incident is a specific criminal act involving one or more victims or victimizations.

[c]Per 1,000 persons age 12 or older.

[d]Preliminary homicide estimates retrieved from Hoyert DL, Xu JQ. (2012) Deaths: Preliminary data for 2011. *National Vital Statistics Reports*, 61(6).

Sources: Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey, 1993–2011; and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System (WISQARS), 1993–2010. Retrieved March 2013 from www.cdc.gov/ncipc/wisqars.

Bureau of Justice Statistics cite:
• Firearm-related homicides declined 39%, from 18,253 in 1993 to 11,101 in 2011 • Nonfatal firearm crimes declined 69%, from 1.5 million victimizations in 1993 to 467,300 victimizations in 2011 • For both fatal and nonfatal firearm victimizations, the majority of the decline occurred during the 10-year period from 1993 to 2002. The era of this decline was overseen by more guns than the 2002-2011 period (See: GSS Graph). If more guns means more gun deaths, why did the majority of the decline occur not when there was less guns, but more guns per household and per adult? • About 70% to 80% of firearm homicides and 90% of nonfatal firearm victimizations were committed with a handgun from 1993 to 2011. • In 2004, among state prison inmates who possessed a gun at the time of offense, less than 2% bought their firearm at a flea

market or gun show and 40% obtained their firearm from an illegal source. (More proof of Chicago info)

To the GSS - General Social Survey https://web.archive.org/web/20230324083302/https://www.norc.org/PDFs/GSS%20Reports/GSS_Trends%20in%20Gun%20Ownership_US_1972-2014.pdf (Cited Below)

• Average Gun Ownership between 1993-2002 - 37.233% • Average Gun Ownership between 2002-2011 - 33.28%
To a citation that gun ownership was decreasing in the period of 1993-2002 which caused a decreasing rate of gun violence - Here's a graph to explore that possibility and the relationships therein (Created by GSS + BJS Graphs shown)

Table 1. Trends in Household Gun Ownership

	% of Households with Guns					% of Adults in Households with Guns					
	Gun	No Gun	Refused	DK	Missing	Gun	No Gun	Refused	DK	Missing	N
1973	47.0	51.4	1.0	0.0	0.6	48.7	49.5	1.0	0.0	0.7	1504
1974	46.1	52.9	0.7	0.1	0.3	47.6	51.3	0.6	0.1	0.4	1484
1976	46.5	52.0	1.1	0.0	0.4	49.5	48.9	1.2	0.0	0.4	1499
1977	50.4	48.9	0.1	0.1	0.5	53.7	45.6	0.1	0.2	0.4	1530
1980	47.3	51.8	0.1	0.1	0.7	50.3	48.5	0.2	0.1	0.8	1468
1982	45.3	52.9	1.3	0.2	0.3	48.6	49.5	1.3	0.2	0.4	1506
1984	44.9	54.0	0.6	0.1	0.4	48.1	50.5	0.7	0.1	0.5	1473
1985	44.2	54.9	0.7	0.0	0.3	47.9	51.3	0.5	0.0	0.3	1534
1987	46.0	53.3	0.5	0.0	0.1	48.5	50.8	0.5	0.0	0.2	1466
1988	39.8	58.4	1.0	0.0	0.7	43.1	55.3	0.9	0.0	0.7	977
1989	46.0	53.7	0.0	0.0	0.3	48.7	50.9	0.0	0.0	0.4	1033
1990	42.2	56.7	0.0	0.1	1.0	45.4	53.7	0.0	0.1	0.8	917
1991	39.6	58.7	1.0	0.0	0.7	43.4	54.7	1.2	0.0	0.7	993
1993	42.0	57.1	0.7	0.0	0.2	45.4	53.7	0.7	0.0	0.2	1075
1994	40.6	58.1	1.0	0.2	0.2	43.8	54.9	0.9	0.1	0.2	1996
1996	40.1	59.4	0.4	0.1	0.0	43.3	56.2	0.4	0.1	0.0	1923
1998	34.8	64.6	0.3	0.1	0.3	36.5	62.7	0.4	0.1	0.3	1882
2000	32.4	66.1	1.2	0.1	0.2	34.2	64.2	1.3	0.1	0.2	1861
2002	33.5	65.5	1.0	0.0	0.0	36.4	62.7	0.9	0.0	0.0	924
2004	34.7	62.9	1.6	0.2	0.6	37.0	60.8	1.4	0.2	0.6	898
2006	33.1	65.2	1.6	0.1	0.0	34.4	63.8	1.7	0.1	0.0	1984
2008	34.0	64.6	1.1	0.3	0.0	35.9	62.7	1.0	0.4	0.0	1356
2010	31.1	65.0	3.5	0.5	0.0	32.1	63.7	3.6	0.6	0.0	1291
2012	33.1	64.7	2.0	0.2	0.0	34.4	63.4	2.0	0.2	0.0	1314
2014	31.0	65.7	3.2	0.2	0.0	32.4	64.3	3.1	0.2	0.0	1711

Source: GSS

The conclusion, while it appears to be that the decreasing gun rates may equate to decreasing homicide at a quick glance, actually proves that the relationship of the change in gun ownership and the change in homicides is actually in the pro-gun camp.
The relationship can show that for every 1% of people that get a gun in their household, homicide rates go down by .238 per 100,000. Given a U.S. population of 323.1 Million, that equates to 769 lives saved.

At this point you have six choices for what to do with this data:
1. Recognize the positive relationship between lowering homicides and gun ownership. 2. Recognize the positive relationship between a positive change in gun ownership and lowered homicide rates. 3. We've had an increasing number of school shootings, any deaths at school is too many. AR-15s are the most used weapon at school shootings and possess the most potential for killing among civilian grade weapons, which is why I want to ban them. 4. Say that homicides don't equate for all gun deaths, that suicides and accidental deaths are factors we need to consider. 5. Cite England and/or Australia. 6. Say both these relationships are circumstantial and are a factor of other components, and that there are very few cases where gun owners actually defend themselves from homicides which makes the connection here flimsy.
At this point, if there are other arguments please bring them up now. I'm going to address these other arguments. At the end, we can go back and see that 1 + 2 are the only ones that are actually functional and that guns are beneficial to society and individual protection.

Argument 3: Part 1 - School Shootings
First, we need to acknowledge that gun ownership and homicides still are a factor in these findings. So we already have a disconnect in the relationship between school shootings and increased gun ownership statistically. That said, despite the proof that this isn't connected, it would be remiss of me to dismiss the issue wholly and what can be done about it. Also keeping in mind this is a very brief skim into a larger issue.
Let's go back to the U.S. Dept of Justice 1993 - 2011 study, which is again the most recent study conducted by a federal agency with these sorts of statistics.

So despite media coverage, we can see that the amount of homicides at school has gone down 50% since 1992-93 school year to the 2009-2010 school year. So why does it seem like there are more school shootings each year than the last? What can be done about the ones still happening?

TABLE 8

School-associated homicides of youth ages 5 to 18, by location and school years, 1992–93 to 2009–10

School year	Homicides of youth ages 5 to 18		
	Total homicides[a]	Homicides at school[b,c]	Percent of all homicides of youth at school
1992–93	2,719	34	1.3%
1993–94	2,911	29	1.0
1994–95	2,691	28	1.0
1995–96	2,548	32	1.3
1996–97	2,210	28	1.3
1997–98	2,104	34	1.6
1998–99	1,791	33	1.8
1999–00	1,566	14	0.9
2000–01	1,501	14	0.9
2001–02	1,494	16	1.1
2002–03	1,538	18	1.2
2003–04	1,459	23	1.6
2004–05	1,545	22	1.4
2005–06	1,687	21	1.2
2006–07	1,796	32	1.8
2007–08	1,740	21	1.2
2008–09	1,579	17	1.1
2009–10	...	17	...

Note: At school includes on school property, on the way to or from regular sessions at school, and while attending or traveling to or from a school-sponsored event.

...Not available.

[a]Youth ages 5 to 18 from July 1, 1992, through June 30, 2009.

[b]Youth ages 5 to 18 from July 1, 1992, through June 30, 2010.

[c]The data from school year 1999–00 through 2009–10 are subject to change until interviews with school and law enforcement officials have been completed. The details learned during the interviews can occasionally change the classification of a case.

Sources: Table 1.1 from Robers, S., Zhang, J., and Truman, J. (2012). *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2011* (NCES 2012-002/NCJ 236021). National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Homicide data are from: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 1992–2010 School-Associated Violent Deaths Surveillance Study (SAVD); FBI and Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHR), 1992–2009.

• A call to action - Increased media attention and notoriety is a cause of increased levels of school shooting over time. Take this 2015 article (https://web.archive.org/web/20230328171320/https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0117259#sec014) make conclusions that media coverage is a motivating factor to future school shootings and that one shooter leads to another. While school shootings have gone down, the coverage of names and faces has gone up which not only makes it seem like there are more, but creates more in the future (Both peer reviewed, scholarly articles)

• Nihilism & Psychological Confusion - Taken largely from Jordan Peterson's 12 Rules for Life: An Antidote for Chaos (Cited Below) - One member of the Columbine shooters said:
"The human race isn't worth fighting for only worth killing. Give the Earth back to the animals. They deserve it infinitely more than we do. Nothing means anything anymore."

These people believe systemically and wholeheartedly:
1. Human beings are worthy of contempt 2. They are doing something morally right and deeply just when committing these heinous acts on innocent people. 3. Human experience leads to evil 4. The inevitability of pain and death equates to a nihilistic approach in regards to inflicting it or minimizing it.

There are many proposed ideas for how to counteract this, as a whole we need to address that this is a system of ideas that hurts innocent schoolchildren. If we reinforce this idea that no

values are greater than others, that the ends justify the means, that there is no direction to life, and that we have no responsibility or obligation to make the world a better place - we end up with more mass shooters with this fundamental belief as well.
How can we fix this? We acknowledge that life is difficult, that pain and suffering can come. We also confess back that responsibility gives meaning to life, that we have a responsibility to help minimize the suffering of both ourselves and others and that means that life matters.

Argument 3 Part 2 - The AR-15

Let's revisit the aim of gun control. The only moral reason for gun control is to achieve the result of saving human lives. Outside that, regulation is not justified as the government does not have the responsibility to protect "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness".
So you want to ban the AR-15, and the only reason to do so is to save lives. Why just the AR-15 then? Why not handguns? After All, according to the previous statistics by the U.S. Department of Justice, about 70% to 80% of firearm homicides and 90% of nonfatal firearm victimizations were committed with a handgun from 1993 to 2011. So if the end goal is saving lives, you should want to ban the handgun over the AR-15. And if you want to ban the AR-15 because it has the potential to kill more people rather than the amount of people it actually kills, that is simply using feelings over facts. Which is dismissive to reality and the truth.
The very fact remains that an AR-15 is still a gun, and is still the same. It is a car, a neutral tool, not a cigarette. Its potential doesn't automatically change it from something that can be good or bad depending on the user to always negative.
That's this entire section. The argument that you can only ban AR-15s if you're after a goal of saving lives is faulty and based on emotion. If you're going to advocate gun control, it has to be for all guns or no guns, given handguns have some of the lowest potential of all guns to kill people and if your stance is on potential and lethality, which it must be to be morally justified, you are stuck in a all-or-nothing situation. Ban all guns, or ban no guns.

Argument 4 - Suicide & Accidental Deaths by Firearms

You can't necessarily directly correlate the amount of suicides to the amount of guns. People who are really going to kill themselves and mean it will find a way to obtain lethal means, and it is impossible to stop them from doing so. There may or may not be a slight relationship, but any statistics are purely hypothetical in terms of how they would actually affect suicides. So we can't factor firearm suicides, if someone is truly going to kill themselves and don't have access to firearms, they will simply jump off a building, use the "escape bag", or a variety of other methods to achieve the end result.
Second in argument 4 is that accidental gun deaths are a factor to consider. Certainly, and the second amendment alludes to this when it refers to "A well regulated Militia". People need training to properly use their firearms to lower accidental gun deaths. This is an entirely separate issue to gun control, believing this is an issue is not cause to take guns away from everyone. Especially given the data provided that shows that homicides are lowered by gun ownership. If you really want to save lives, you want to find a way to prevent accidental gun deaths while letting people own firearms and receive training.

Continuing on the accidental gun death approach - gun control has shown a trend to not allow people to recieve training for firearms. Take Chicago, where gun control laws are incredibly high (see: England Argument). In 2010, the city imposed an all-encompassing ban on shooting ranges. When the Court of Appeals deemed this to be unconstitutional in 2011, the city council proceeded to pass ordinances that achieved this regardless (https://web.archive.org/web/20210702011856/https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/breaking/ct-chicago-gun-range-restrictions-20170118-story.html). As a whole we can see that the gun control side wishes to restrict the training of civilians rather than education and training in use and safety of firearms.
But really, the takeaway from this is that suicide is not an accurate depiction of gun violence and that accidental deaths are an issue that is not mutually exclusive to the idea of gun ownership.

Argument 5: People don't use guns to defend themselves (or don't use them very often).

Gun Ownership + Protection w/ CDC Study
https://web.archive.org/web/20210325161002/https://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/cdc-gun-violence-study-goes-against-media-narrative/

CDC to the Institute of Medicine and National Research Council, also revealed that while there were "about 300,000 violent crimes involving firearms in 2008," the estimated number of defensive uses of guns ranges "from about 500,000 to more than 3 million per year."

"Studies that directly assessed the effect of actual defensive uses of guns have found consistently lower injury rates among gun-using crime victims compared with victims who used other self-protective strategies." (Of course, saying no with a gun v/ saying no without a gun.)

"One "body of research" (Kleck and Gertz, 1995) cited by the study found "estimated annual gun use for self-defense" to be "up to 2.5 million incidents, suggesting that self-defense can be an important crime deterrent."

Not much more to be said here. The idea that people don't use guns to defend themselves is a myth, plain and simple.

Argument 6: England
Hold on to your seatbelts, because we're getting meaty again. Let's start our discussion of England by going to Chicago and drawing conclusions that we'll use in discussing England (which is really a pro-gun argument).
Chicago is rampant with violent crime and gun deaths, 762 reported in 2016 alone. Their city has huge restrictions placed on civilian access to firearms. So what does this

prove? As we'll show later, civilians do defend themselves with firearms at a rate greater than the amount of crimes committed with guns, supported by the stats at the start of this discussion as well. It is, | think, fairly inaccurate to say that people get around gun regulation by the black market in Chicago, though that is certainly a factor. Largely, people go to Indiana, a state with much lower regulations, and bring them into Chicago.
So Violent people will go to great lengths to acquire ways to hurt people.
People who have their second amendment rights regulated can't protect themselves at the rates seen across the country as a whole.
Tie-in: Gun restrictions only prevent people from defending themselves in Chicago. A lot of pro-gun people would say that this is proof on its own that gun control doesn't work without acknowledging the next step in the argument. Gun control has to then conclude that federal gun restrictions would be mandatory and enforceable to ensure that you can't go to another state to acquire a firearm such as in the case of Chicago.
So let's keep all this in mind and move to England, where civilians are not allowed to have firearms.
In 2017, more than two acid attacks were made per day in a 6-month period. (https://web.archive.org/web/20230621044019/https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/acid-attacks-uk-highest-world-figures-police-revealed-a8098236.html)

Conclusion: Taking away guns only takes away protection, it doesn't take away methods of committing violence - it only increases the rate of homicides and violence in a country.

References

Planty, M., & Truman, J. L. (2013, May). Firearm Violence, 1993-2011[PDF]. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Smith, T. W., & Son, J. (2015, March). Trends in Gun Ownership in the United States, 1972-2014[PDF]. Chicago: NORC at the University of Chicago.

Towers, Sherry, et al. "Contagion in Mass Killings and School Shootings." Plos One, vol. 10, no. 7. Feb. 2015, do1:10.1371/journal pone 0117259.

Lankford, Adam, and Sara Tomek. "Mass Killings in the United States from 2006 to 2013: Social Contagion or Random Clusters?" Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 2017, do1:10.1111/sltb.12366.

Appeals court rules restrictions to gun ranges in Chicago are unconstitutional. (2017, January 19). Retrieved March 11, 2018, from http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/breaking/ct-chicago-gun-range-restrictions-20170118 story. html

IBD EDITORIAL BOARD. & IBD. (-0001. November 30). CDC Gun Violence Study's Findings Not What Obama Wanted | Stock News & Stock Market Analysis - IBD. Retrieved March 11. 2018. from https://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/cdc-gun-violence-study-goes-against-media-narrative/

Lizzie Dearden Home Affairs Correspondent. (2017, December 07). UK has one of highest rates of acid attacks in the world, police reveal. Retrieved March 11, 2018, from http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/acid-attacks-uk-highest-world-figures-police-revealed-a8098236.html

PETERSON. J. B. (2019). 12 RULES FOR LIFE: an antidote to chaos. S.1.: PENGUIN BOOKS.
Alpers, P. (n.d.). Gun Law and Policy: Firearms and armed violence, country by country. Retrieved March 11, 2018, from http://www gunpolicy.org/